SOC - COMMUNISM - 1

ARCA SEMINARY
PROV. MO. THEOL.

Why the Church has Condemned Socialism.

With Notes on

(A) Catholics and the Labour Party.

(B) Is the Labour Party Socialist?

LIBRARY
St. Mary's College
St. Marys, KANSAS

By HENRY SOMERVILLE.

6.3

OXFORD:
THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD PUBLICATIONS.

A PRIMER OF SOCIAL SCIENCE. By Rt. Rev. Mgr. Parkinson. 3s. 6d.

A PRIMER OF PEACE AND WAR. Ed. by Rev. C. Plater, S.J. 2s. 6d.

THE CHURCH AND EUGENICS (new and revised edition). By Rev. T. Gerrard. 1s. 6d.

THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY. By Margaret Fletcher. 1s. 6d.

THE CHRISTIAN CITIZEN. By Susan Cunnington. 1s. 6d.

CATHOLIC FORCES. (C.S.G. "Year Book," 1921) 1s. 6d.

A CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CRUSADE (new edition) 1s

THE CATHOLIC WORKERS' COLLEGE AT OXFORD. (C.S.G. "Year Book," 1922.) 1s.

A DICTIONARY FOR SOCIAL STUDENTS. By Rev. J. Murphy, S.J. 6d.

GUILD SOCIALISM. A Criticism of the National Guild Theory. By Francis Goldwell. 6d.

ELEMENTS OF HOUSING. By Rev. C. Tigar, S.J., 6d.

THE GOSPEL AND THE CITIZEN. By Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. 4d. 1s. in cloth.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORKER. By V. M. Crawford. 4d.

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By Rev. J. Keating, S.J., and S. A. Parker, O.S.B. 4d.

ELEMENTS OF ECONOMICS. By Rev. Lewis Watt, S.J. 4d.

A CATHOLIC SOCIAL PLATFORM. By Rev. J. Husslein, S.J. 2d.

THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE TO THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH. By the Rev. J. B. McLaughlin, O.S.B., and A. P. Mooney, M.D. 2d.

C. S. G. LAWS OF NATIONS SERIES.

THE POPE'S PEACE NOTE. Text and Comments.

REPLIES TO THE POPE'S APPEAL.

THE LAW OF NATIONS: WHAT IT IS. By Gertrude Robinson.

THE RESTORATION OF THE LAW OF NATIONS. By F. F. Urquhart.

NATIONAL TRIBUNALS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW. By Gertrude Robinson.

FREE SEAS IN PEACE AND WAR. By M. Sidney Parry; price 1d. each. The series bound, 1s.

SOCIALISM OR DEMOCRACY. By Fr. Cuthbert O.S.F.C. 3d.

All books post free. Order from Catholic Social Guild, Oxford.

ARCA SEMINARII
Prov. Mo. Theol.

Why the Church has Condemned Socialism.

The question is still often asked: "Can a Catholic be a Socialist?" The answer would be easy if Socialism were a clear, constant definite thing, but it is, on the contrary, something very vague and variable, or at least the name is applied indiscriminately to a large number of different theories ranging from the Communism of Lenin and Trotsky to the moderate nationalisation schemes of Mr. Sydney Webb.

The answer to the question of whether a Catholic can be a Socialist evidently depends on what is meant by Socialism, for the word is so loosely used nowadays that it is often applied to doctrines which are certainly consistent with Catholic teaching as well as with others which are as certainly inconsistent. Nevertheless the Church has ordinarily used the word Socialism to denote condemned doctrines and therefore the word should never be used by Catholics to describe their own position.

The Church has pronounced on Socialism in a long series of official utterances. If we study these utterances in their historical setting we find that the Church has been dealing not with merely abstract heresies but with Socialism as a living movement, as an organised force in the actual world. The year 1848 may be taken for the starting-point of our enquiry, since it is taken by Socialists themselves as marking one of the greatest years in their history. In that year appeared the famous Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels with its opening words as follows:

> "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre, Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police spies."

We have no space to tell of all the sinister events of 1848, but we will recall the Roman Revolution of that year when the noble-minded Chief Minister of the Papal States, Count Pellegrino Rossi, was assassinated, the papal palace broken into by the mob, the Pope threatened with the massacre of his household, and His Holiness himself forced to flee to Gaeta. It was whilst at Gaeta that the Pope, Pius IX., pronounced an Allocution in which he declared that the demands of the revolutionists propagated

> "the domination of that horrible and deplorable system, opposed to reason itself and the law of nature, which is called Communism and also Socialism."

In the year 1849 the Pope addressed an Encyclical to the Italian Bishops in which he repeatedly insisted that Socialism and Communism were the enemy of the Church and of human society, and the motive force among the revolutionaries who had so abominably outraged the Holy See.

> "It is evident," says the Holy Father, "that the teachers of Communism or Socialism, though employing various methods and different means, have one common end of keeping up continual agitation, and gradually leading to greater crimes workmen and the lower classes, deceived by their artful language, seduced by their promise of a happier lot, in order to have their help afterwards in attacking every kind of supreme authority, in pillaging, wasting and invading first the property of the Church and then of all other private individuals, to violate at last all rights divine and human, and to bring about the destruction of the

worship of God, and the overthrow of all order in civil society."

We have quoted the opening paragraph of *The Communist Manifesto*: we now quote the concluding paragraph of that document to show that the Pope's description of Communism and Socialism is applicable to the movement of which Marx and Engels were the leaders:

> "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.
>
> Working men of all countries, unite."

We pass on to the year 1878 when Pius IX. died and Leo XIII. ascended to the Chair of St. Peter. In that first year of his pontificate Leo XIII. issued his encyclical *Concerning Modern Errors: Socialism, Communism, Nihilism.* Pope Leo recalls that his glorious predecessor, by Allocutions and Encyclicals, "had denounced by name the plague of Socialism." Pope Leo also notes that the Socialists of his time were wont "to turn to evil use the Gospel itself so as to deceive more readily the unwary." There had been in the year 1878, as the Pope bears witness, a widespread growth of the international revolutionary movement and it was for this reason that the Encyclical was written. After referring to "the plague which is tainting Society to its very core," the Pope says:

> "You understand as a matter of course, Venerable Brothers, that we are alluding to that sect of men who, under the motley and all but barbarous terms and titles of Socialists, Communists and Nihilists, are spread abroad throughout the world and bound

intimately together in baneful alliance, no longer look for strong support in secret meetings held in darksome places, but standing forth openly and boldly in the light of day, strive to carry out their purpose, long resolved upon, of uprooting the foundations of civilised society at large. . . ."

It is clear from this quotation that the Pope is thinking not of merely bookish theories but an organised, active, world-wide movement. He was describing the Socialist movement as he saw it before his eyes. In the years 1877-8 there had been disorder and bloody uprisings in many parts of Europe, especially in Italy where there were two attempts on the life of King Humbert. The Pope was speaking with strict accuracy when he spoke of one sect of men, with the motley titles of Socialists, Communists and Nihilists, internationally organised and carrying on publicly a revolutionary propaganda. It was about the year 1870 that the famous "First International" reached its zenith. In this organisation the German Marx, the Italian Mazzini and the Russian Bakunin were the most prominent figures. Their personal quarrels led to the decay of the organisation but the various factions continued their propaganda very actively. The most extreme faction was that of Bakunin, the Nihilist, who called his organisation the "Alliance of the Socialist Democracy." Bakunin, the Nihilist, described himself as a Socialist and we know from *The Communist Manifesto* that Marx and Engels styled themselves Communists and Socialists indifferently. Though they had their domestic differences, Socialists, Communists and Nihilists or Anarchists formed one movement, one organisation, one power, and they all declared with the *Manifesto* that their ends "could only be attained by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

To describe the kind of Socialism that was the prevailing Socialism between 1848 and 1878 is sufficient explanation of the reason why the Church condemned and opposed the movement with all her power. There were, indeed, during that period, various non-revolutionary theorists who called themselves Socialists. They were despised as spurious by the militant Socialists, as we know from the *Manifesto*, and they were of little practical account. Pius IX. and Leo XIII. must have known of these minor Socialist schools but they are neither specifically included in nor excluded from the papal general condemnations of Socialism. The Socialism that mattered was the violent, revolutionary Socialism. In resisting this the Church was defending civilisation. Had Marx and Engels and Mazzini and Bakunin had their way they would have done what Lenin and Trotsky have done in Russia and all Western Europe would have suffered the fate that Russia has suffered. Nothing more need be said to show why the Church maintained her opposition to Socialism up to the year 1878.

After 1878 the Socialist movement in most countries underwent great changes. Indeed, the process of change may be dated from the failure of the Communist rising in 1871. It became more inclined to work for the attainment of its end by constitutional instead of by violent means. At the same time it began to confine itself more to economic ends, i.e., the abolition of capitalist property, and to be less pronounced in its propaganda against the Church and the family. This process of modification continued until the outbreak of the late war. It had become very apparent in 1889 when the *Fabian Essays* were published. The new modified Socialism was that of the Fabian Society and the

I.L.P. in England, of those called Revisionists (because they revised Marxian doctrines) in Germany, and of the Reformists, as distinguished from the Revolutionists, in France.

We must grasp the historical fact that "reformist" Socialism had to a considerable extent made headway against "revolutionary" Socialism in the year 1891, because in that year appeared a new papal condemnation of Socialism. This was the great Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. *On the Condition of the Working Classes.* If there had been no papal pronouncement after 1878 the changes in the character of the Socialist movement might have been regarded as rendering the early condemnations obsolete. Yet it was after the modified form of Socialism called State Socialism or Collectivism had come to the front that Pope Leo issued his greatest of Encyclicals and he reaffirmed his condemnation of Socialism. That the Pope was fully cognisant of the differences between the dominant Socialism of 1878 and the dominant Socialism of 1891 is plain to anyone who reads the two Encyclicals. In 1878 the Pope described a Socialism which scorned the sacred institution of marriage, which preached rebellion against governments, and which advocated violent seizure of the property of the rich. In 1891 the Pope deals with a Socialism that would have property "administered by the State or by municipal bodies"; he deals with the Socialists who admit private *use* of the soil and its various fruits but who deny the right of private individuals to possess the land outright.

Pope Leo XIII. brings two main arguments against the State Socialist proposals to transfer property from private hands to the community. The Pope says those proposals are, first, unjust because they would rob the lawful possessor, and second,

they would bring State action into a sphere not within its competence.

In order to prove that Socialism would rob the lawful possessor, the Pope establishes the doctrine that man has a right to private property. It is sometimes questioned whether the right extends to goods for production as well as to goods for consumption. It is clear from Pope Leo's teaching that the right does extend to productive goods because the Pope says that a man who invests his savings in the purchase of land has the same right as he would have to his wage. Pope Pius X. in the year 1903 specifically recalled this teaching of Pope Leo XIII. in emphasising that:

> "With regard to the goods of this earth, man has not only, like the animals, the use of them, but also the right of permanent ownership: and this, not only with reference to those goods which are consumed in being used, but also with reference to others."

Private property being a natural right, the State expropriation proposed by Socialism would be unjust and is therefore condemned by the Church. This supposes that Socialism does not compensate the dispossessed owners. If Socialism does compensate adequately it shows respect for the rights of private owners and thereby escapes this particular condemnation. But no Socialism, not even the moderate Socialism of the Fabian Society, recognises the *right* of private property. Much property it will leave in private hands, because it would not be convenient to socialise it, and to those private owners whom it expropriates it would offer, in the words of the Fabian Programme, not compensation, but "such relief as may seem fit to the community."

The second argument that Pope Leo brings against Socialism is that it would bring State action into a

sphere not within its competence. This argument needs to be carefully followed, and in summarising the teaching of the Encyclical we are endeavouring to keep to the very words of the Pope. Man is, says the Pope, not only an animal with the need of satisfying his immediate wants from day to day; man is a rational being with the power of taking thought for the future and providing for that future; he is master of his own acts, with power to exercise his choice "not only as to matters that regard his present welfare, but also about those things which he deems may be for his advantage in time yet to come." Hence he can not only appropriate wealth but the sources of wealth, not only the fruits of the earth but the very soil. He may provide not only for his present needs but also for the future.

The Socialist admits the need of providing for the future but he says that the State will do this in the interests of the citizens. But the Pope opposes this. Man has the right to provide for himself without bringing in at this stage the interference of the State. Man precedes the State and has the right of providing for himself independently by means of private property.

The Pope clinches this argument for private property by reference to the Family. The rights spoken of, he says, as belonging to each individual man are seen in much stronger light when considered in relation to man's domestic obligations. The Family is a natural society, anterior to every kind of State or nation, invested with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the civil community. If man as an individual has the right of providing for his needs by means of private, permanent, productive property, much more has he the right of providing for his Family. It is no answer to say

that the State will provide. The Family is a society with at least equal rights to those of the State in the choice and securing of the things it needs for its preservation and its liberty.

In setting forth the teaching of Pope Leo XIII. above we have confined ourselves almost to the very words of the Pope, as anyone may see by consulting the Encyclical *On the Condition of the Working Classes.* In what follows we shall, in an attempt at clearer explanation, put the Pope's argument in another way; but because it is not literally the Pope's way the reader will justifiably regard our words with some reserve. It is far from our mind to deprive Catholics of their legitimate liberty of interpretation of the Pope's teaching.

The Pope claims for private persons and for families a certain economic liberty which can only be secured by the institution of private property; and for the State to take away that liberty is to trespass beyond the State's proper province and to invade the private domain. We are not utterly dependent upon the State for everything. We are not to have no chance of employment except as State employees; we are not to have no power of providing for our future except as State dependants; we are not to have no right of acquiring property except in such amounts and of such kinds as the State may of its good pleasure determine. We cannot assent to having all our lives governed by the State's view of its own interests. A father has a right to be the provider for his family and not to have his children dependent upon the State's bounty. But if the State is actually or substantially the sole owner of the means of production, the sole master of the material means of life, the sole employer at whose disposal men must place their labour, the sole

seller at whose counters all must buy, then there can be no such thing as individual or family independence. The Socialist may promise us abundance and security but even if the promise be fulfilled it will only be the security enjoyed by State dependants. Has the State the right to reduce us to this dependence? The Church answers No! Man has the right of providing for himself; families have the right of providing for themselves; the gifts of nature are at the disposal of man for his individual and family provision. Men and families had these rights anterior to the State; they cannot be abrogated or absorbed by the State. The State has no moral competence to undertake all economic functions. There is a sphere outside which it may not go without injustice. The State breaks moral bounds if it does not allow individuals and families the permanent ownership of productive property by which they can maintain themselves independently of the State.

In one word, private property is the condition of liberty. The State monopoly of property means State despotism under which every citizen would be a serf. The liberty of the Church itself, as well as the liberty of individuals and families, is bound up with the maintenance of private property. The Church is a society, an organisation which can only live and function if it has material means at its disposal. It needs revenue for daily maintenance of its servants and it needs permanent possession of buildings and lands for churches, schools, convents, monasteries, seminaries, novitiates and so on. We may suppose that the Socialist State would allow men and women to devote themselves to the priesthood and to religious orders if they wished to. We may suppose that the Socialist State would permit

lay Catholics, out of their earnings as State employees, to provide for the support of their clergy. Even so how would the Church get lands and buildings as she wanted them? She could only get them from the State for there would be no other landlord, no other builder. The Church might have, out of the voluntary contributions of her children, the wherewithal to pay rent to the State, but always the Church would hold as tenant of the State, she would hold only on the State's terms. So far as Socialism prevailed and the State was the owner of the means of production there is nothing that the Church might want, from a missal to a monastery, which she would not have to ask from the State. The Church would have nothing permanent of her own in full possession to dispose of as she willed. "But the State will be all right," says the Socialist. "The State will give everything that is reasonably required. The State will be anxious to grant such building sites on long leases and easy conditions as the Church may desire. The State administration will not be obstructing or embarrassing or pin-pricking or oppressive." But the Church has had a long experience of State administrations and she would rather not surrender herself completely to their tender mercies. The Church would prefer the opportunity of becoming a freeholder rather than inescapably a tenant of the State landlord. The Church prefers full ownership and control of her material resources instead of helpless dependance on the edicts of Whitehall.

Whenever Socialists try to answer these arguments they answer by whittling down Socialism. They will preserve the liberty of the press under Socialism, by allowing the private ownership of printing presses! They will safeguard the liberty of the

Church under Socialism by allowing the Church the full and permanent ownership and free disposal of material resources including land! This would be satisfactory, but it would not be Socialism.

It would be an unending task to discuss all the possible modifications of Socialism. Socialists have a way of abandoning one by one the tenets of Socialism when they are pressed in argument until we get to so-called Socialists who profess the most unbounded devotion to the rights of private property! If Socialism continues the moulting progress which has characterised its history it may one day become less like a hawk and more of a dove. All the objectionable associations of its name may then be forgotten.

For Catholics the important fact to remember is that the Church has combated Socialism from its beginnings. She has never spoken of Socialism except with detestation, and this is as true of Pope Benedict XV. as of Pius X. or Leo XIII. or Pius IX. Looking back to the year when the *Communist Manifesto* challenged the Christianity and the civilisation of Europe and when Count Rossi perished under the dagger of the assassin, all men except Leninites see how necessary it was that the Church should resist the Socialist advance. For by common consent European Socialism from 1848 to 1871, the year of the Paris Commune, was a movement of violence, anarchy and irreligion. Its success would have reduced Western Europe to the ruin that that self-same Socialism has brought Russia to-day. Let no one forget that Lenin and Trotsky consider themselves as nothing but the true disciples of Marx, and that Bolshevism has no significance but that it is Socialism. A great many Socialists, perhaps the majority of Socialists, throughout Europe

still pay tribute to Russia as the country that has been the first to enter the Socialist way. Any upholder of social order who knows what theories have guided Lenin will be grateful to the Papacy which, in the critical years of the 19th century, opposed itself to the Socialist flood in Western Europe.

It is true that after the debacle of the Paris Commune, Socialists began to lose faith in violence. By the beginning of the 20th century it might be said that the revolutionary Socialists were no longer the dominant Socialists. Revisionism or Fabianism was supplanting Marxism in Germany, France and England. Socialists themselves had come to see the dangerous madness of their forerunners. In 1908 Mr. Bernard Shaw ridiculed the "catastrophic" Socialists who conceived of Socialism "as a destructive insurrection ending, if successful, in millennial absurdities." Mr. Shaw thought that there were no such Socialists left. He has no doubt learned something since from Russia. The Fabian Socialism in which Mr. Shaw takes pride has won a number of middle-class converts but it has not laid the spectre of Communism. State Socialism has now few advocates among the workers. The projects of "Guild Socialism" and "Nationalisation with Workers' Control" which the latest school of Socialists are trying to think out, arise from a perception of the dangers of tyranny implied in State Socialism. Here again, this development in Socialist thought is a tribute to the prescience of the Pope, for as this article has shown, it was because complete State ownership implied excessive State power that Pope Leo XIII. argued against Socialism.

The history of Socialism is a history of failures, of changes of front, of abandonment of principles

and of periodical tragedies like the Roman revolution of 1848, the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Russian Terror of our own day. We may accept the dictum of the American Socialist, W. E. Walling, and say that "The only possible definition of Socialism is the Socialist movement." The history of Socialism is the best way of showing why the Church has opposed it. The Church still opposes Socialism because every form of Socialism is inimical, in a greater or less degree, to the right of private property which must be upheld if we are to escape from the anarchy of revolutionary Socialism on the one hand or the slavery of State Socialism on the other.

NOTE A.

Catholics and the Labour Party.

At a meeting of a certain Catholic organisation a resolution was passed declaring that a Catholic could not be a Socialist, that the Labour Party was a Socialist Party, and that therefore Catholic members should leave the Labour Party. The resolution was widely reported in the newspapers and was even represented as being an authoritative pronouncement that a Catholic could not belong to the Labour Party. The fact is that the resolution expressed only the private opinion of a few persons and had no doctrinal authority whatever.

No Catholic authority has ever questioned the right of Catholics to belong to the Labour Party. Some eminent Catholic authorities have explicitly asserted that right. The Bishop of Northampton, in his Lent Pastoral of 1919, pointed out that the Labour Party had passed under the domination of a socialist executive, but that the duty of Catholics was not to leave the party, but to purge it.

The late Archbishop of Liverpool, Dr. Whiteside, spoke at a meeting in Wigan in October, 1919, and referred specially to those who have urged that Catholics

should not belong to the Labour Party. The *Catholic Times* reported the Archbishop's words as follows: "He (the Archbishop) thought he was breaking no confidence when he said that the whole question as to the position which had been taken up by the Labour Party in connection with the social formula was having the careful attention of the Holy See, and when Rome speaks, added His Grace, the question will be ended. We must wait until Rome speaks, and then we will know what to do. . . . The Church had left them with liberty. Until the Church deprived them of it, let them stick to their liberty."

NOTE B.

Is the Labour Party Socialist?

It has been asserted that the Labour Party is Socialist, and that it became Socialist in 1918. The ground for the assertion is that in 1918 a new constitution of the Party was adopted which, in its statement of the objects of the Party, contained the following clause:—

> "To secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, *upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production* and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service."

The italics are ours. The words italicised are those which, on the face of it, are socialistic. But the words are capable of different interpretations. We shall take the interpretation officially given in a leaflet written by Mr. Sidney Webb and published by the Labour Party itself. The leaflet is entitled "The New Constitution of the Labour Party." Mr. Sidney Webb says:—

> "Its (the Labour Party's) policy of 'common ownership,' brings it, as a similar evolution brought John Stuart Mill—to use his own words in the *Autobiography*—'decidedly under the general designation of Socialist.' But it is a Socialism which is no more specific than a definite repudiation of the individual-

ism that characterised all the political parties of the past generation, and still dominates the House of Commons. This declaration of the Labour Party leaves it open to choose from time to time whatever forms of common ownership, from the co-operative store to the nationalised railway, and whatever forms of popular administration and control of industry, from national guilds to ministries of employment, may, in particular cases, commend themselves."

It may strike the reader of Mr. Sidney Webb's gloss on the constitution that the Labour Party does not number precision of language among the qualities it exemplifies. The term "common ownership" is hopelessly ambiguous and is evidently intended to be so. A "Socialism" which is "no more specific than a definite repudiation of the individualism that characterised all the political parties of the past generation" is certainly not the kind of Socialism that the Church condemns. Pope Leo XIII himself repudiated the individualism that characterised the political parties of the past generation. Mr. Sidney Webb would presumably bring the Pope "under the general designation of Socialist!" We cannot prevent men from misusing words, and the Labour Party may be called Socialist in the very non-specific sense of Mr. Sidney Webb. But Catholics when they condemn Socialism, use the word in a much more specific sense. The Labour Party, as its constitution is explained by Mr. Sidney Webb—and no more authoritative spokesman can be found—is not Socialist at all in the sense in which Catholics use the term.

We trust that we shall not be understood as implying any approval of the Labour Party constitution or its terminology. On the contrary, we think that such a misleading use of the words "common ownership," is deplorable. But if they mean only what Mr. Webb, the principal author of the constitution, says they mean, they do not mean what Catholics mean by Socialism and the Labour Party is not, therefore, to be regarded as a Socialist Party.

S. Walker, Printer, Hinckley.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY PUBLICATIONS.

(*Stocked and Supplied by the C. S. G.*)

TWO SHILLINGS.

THE POPE AND THE PEOPLE. Select Letters and Addresses on Social Questions by Pope Leo XIII. With Preface by C. S. Devas, M.A., and Introduction by Right Rev. Mgr. Canon Parkinson.

THE CATHOLIC TEMPERANCE READER. By Right Rev. Mgr. Cologan and Sir Francis Cruise, M.D.

SIXPENCE EACH (Wrapper).

SOCIAL QUESTIONS AND THE DUTY OF CATHOLICS. By C. S. Devas, M.A.

WHAT CHRISTIANITY HAS DONE FOR WOMEN. By Gabriel d'Azambjua. Translated by Lady Gibbs.

RELIGIOUS RIGHTS OF THE CATHOLIC POOR. A Handbook for Catholic Guardians. By W. C. Maude.

FOURPENCE.

THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASSES. (The Encyclical Rerum Novarum.) By Pope Leo XIII. Edited by Right Rev. Mgr. Canon Parkinson, D.D.

TWOPENCE EACH.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY BEFORE THE REFORMATION. By Cardinal Gasquet, O.S.B.

CHRISTIAN WOMANHOOD.

CONJUGAL LIFE: THE DUTIES OF. By Cardinal Mercier.

DIVORCE. By Archbishop Keating.

ENGLISH ECONOMICS AND CATHOLIC ETHICS. By Rev. M. Maher.

FRANCIS, ST., AS SOCIAL REFORMER. By Fr. Thomas, O.S.F.C.

LABOUR: THE CHURCH AND. By Abbot Snow, O.S.B.

LANDLORDS: A DIALOGUE ON. By R. P. Garrold, S.J.

LEAKAGE: HOW TO STOP THE. By Rev. J. H. Wright, S.J.

ROME AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION.

C. T. S. Publications (Continued) 2d. each.

SOCIAL SENSE, THE: ITS DECAY AND ITS REVIVAL. By A. P. Mooney, M.D.
SOCIALISM: THE CHURCH AND. By Hilaire Belloc.
SOCIALISM: AN EXAMINATION OF. By same.
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE PRINCIPLE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY. By same.
CATHOLIC SOCIAL REFORM VERSUS SOCIALISM. By same.
TEMPERANCE CATECHISM. By Right Rev. Mgr. Cologan.
"THINGS THAT ARE CAESAR'S: THE." By Rev. J. Keating, S.J.
TRADE UNIONISM. By Henry Somerville.
UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.
WOMAN IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. H. F. Hall.
FAMILY LIFE. By Rev. Jos. Rickaby, S.J.
THE DUTIES OF PARENTS TOWARDS THEIR CHILDREN. By Rev. Bertram Wolferstan, S.J.
WHY WE RESIST DIVORCE. By the Rev. H. Thurston, S.J.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD.

OBJECTS—

(*a*) To promote among Catholics the study of Social Questions.

(*b*) To facilitate intercourse between Catholic Students and workers.

(*c*) To assist in applying Catholic principles to the solution of actual social problems.

Note.—The Guild takes no part in party politics.

Membership open to all Catholics. Minimum subscription 1s. Subscribers of 2s. 6d. are entitled to *The Christian Democrat* monthly. Subscribers of 5s. and over receive *The Christian Democrat*, the Year Book, and new publications under 6d.

METHODS—

(*a*) Formation of Study Clubs.
(*b*) Circulation of Catholic Social Literature.
(*c*) *The Christian Democrat* (issued monthly, 2d.)
(*d*) An Annual Summer School.
(*e*) The Catholic Workers' College.